SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VIII, No. 5 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | March 15, 1978

Science "Scandals" Causing a Bit of Worry

A growing — but mainly privately discussed — concern among Washington's managers and elder statesmen of academic research is that the general public may be registering an aroma of serious financial irregularities in science's dealings with government.

The basis for this concern is to be found in an abundance of news reports concerning alleged hanky-panky in the use of research funds. The National Cancer Institute, for example, has been accused of slovenliness in overseeing its support of the Eppley Institute, in Omaha; the Harvard School of Public Health has been accused by one of its researchers of applying research funds to purposes other than what they were originally intended for; and, most recently, Rep. Dan Flood (D-Pa.) has been accused of misusing his position as chairman of the HEW-Labor appropriations subcommittee to strongarm cash contributions from at least one NIH client.

These, and many similar allegations, are backed up by varying degrees of evidence, ranging from implausible to persuasive, though it's worth noting that at least as far as we know, none of these matters has ripened to the point where criminal proceedings have been instituted. There have been plenty of administrative actions, a handful of civil suits, and lots of ongoing investigations, often involving troops of auditors suddenly descending upon an institution to examine the records.

French Elections: Wooing The Science Vote--- Page 3

Meanwhile, reports of alleged wrongdoing continue in the press, and there can be little doubt that mud is falling on the relatively pristine image that science possesses in this nation's institutional array. Knowledgeable inhabitants of the scientific community may scoff, but poll after poll shows that the public holds science in high esteem as a trustworthy institution. Is that valuable asset of public trust now being frittered away? And, if so, why, and what's being done about the erosion?

One answer is that, at least in the shorterm, there's no reliable way of gauging shifts in public attitudes on a matter of this kind. But the subject is increasingly figuring large as a component of general, informal discussions now going on concerning the framework of federal support for academic research.

The participants in these discussions include the President's Science Adviser, Frank Press, whose office is conducting a study of the mechanisms of federal support for basic research; Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, and representatives of the "DuPont Circle Gang," a term for the cluster of educational associations in that Washington neighborhood.

Two main lines of thought have come to predominate in these discussions. Far in the lead, it appears, is the belief that most, if not all, of the so-called scandals in academe merely reflect, as one educational association executive terms it, "arguments among auditors" — by which he means that the financial support system is so jerrybuilt and complex that no matter what's done, some rule or other is innocently broken. In the view of this discussion participant, there may be "some individual frauds, but I'm yet to see proof of any of the

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Patsy Mink's performance as director of the State Department's Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES) is generally rated to be a disaster. The former Hawaii Congresswomen — who has no apparent qualifications for State's top scientific post — is said to be spending a remarkable amount of time back in her home state: According to staff members at OES, she shows little interest in her present post and even less acquaintanceship with what's going on there.

Robert R. Wilson's budget-induced resignation as director of the Fermilab is written of as a childish fit of pique by the Washington bureaucrats who failed to respond to his demands for a big budget boost for that high-energy physics center. According to one scornful White House science aide, "Wilson sees his lab in a Nobel Prize race and just refused to be patient."

A complete rundown of information services in nearly 100 research-related government organizations is contained in a new publication, "Federal Scientific and Technical Communication Activities," prepared by the National Science Foundation. Copies are available domestically for $6.50 each ($3 microfiche), $13 foreign ($4.50 microfiche) from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Va. 22161. Request PB 272-800.

. . . No Agreement on How to Respond Publicly

serious charges. The main problem," he insisted, "is that when an institution has to juggle 2000 grants that are governed by all sorts of different regulations and that have differing expiration dates, there's bound to be a lot of confusion. The big question isn't fraud. It's whether we can go on with a system that dates back to World War II and that's no longer suitable for these times."

The other view holds that while the system is filled with managerial problems that often lead to an appearance of questionable financial behavior, there's also a "ripoff" factor that the scientific community can ignore only at its peril.

Adherents of this viewpoint regard with some concern the dominance of the managerial analysis, and have been pushing for the scientific community itself to take the lead in forthrightly addressing the issue of deliberate misuse of federal research funds.

The difficulty, of course, is that while all of these students of research finance and management are deep inside the scientific and academic communities, they exercise no power over the problems that concern them.

Federal mechanisms for supporting research are in many instances written into law; the laws themselves often leave a lot of leeway for the Office of Management and Budget and individual agencies to fill in the administrative details, and, finally, research institutions have a fair amount of latitude in using the money that Washington sends them for research.

The effect of this muddle of administrative practice is that no one in Washington can command stricter enforcement of procedures to assure that the recipients are doing as they're supposed to do. That's what the present system — balanced, as it is, between stating the rules and trusting the locals to follow them — is supposed to do. And any tilt toward stricter surveillance from Washington runs into the Administration's loudly propounded goal of reducing government paperwork and interference in local affairs.

An alternative approach to the alleged scandals would be solemn exhortation for the scientific community to behave itself. But that has its own problems. Even if based on the assumption that it's only a few rotten apples infecting an otherwise clean barrel, such an exhortation — coming, perhaps, from one or another nationally recognized research leader — is so vulnerable to misrepresentation by our scandal-mongering press that it's doubtful that any research leader would want to do the sermonizing. Science claims that it is self-regulating in its pursuit of truth. And what is the public to conclude if a prominent leader of science suggests publicly that his colleagues keep their hands out of the till while conducting the pursuit?

Science, of course, bears a burden of proclaiming a high standard of ethics in a society in which virtually all other institutions have, for good reasons, become suspect. And, to a large extent, the attention given reports of scandalous behavior simply reflects a higher expectation on the part of the public, as well as, perhaps, some concealed delight over ethical deviations on the part of the self-proclaimed pure.

Some of those who recommend a forthright response from within the scientific community are arguing that if the problem goes unattended, it's eventually going to be exploited by the right-wing cranks that battered the National Science Foundation several years ago for its support of curriculum-development programs offensive to Middle America's tastes. NSF and its friends could defend the substance of these programs, but when the focus shifted to sloppy administration of their financing, even the most fervent NSF supporter was left in an exposed position.

Congress has so far been fairly quiet in regard to the recent revelations. But it's a crowded legislative calendar rather than lack of interest that accounts for the uncharacteristic calm. Rep. L.H. Fountain (D-NC), chairman of a Government Operations Subcommittee that has in the past raked over NIH for its grants management practices, is heavily occupied with inquiries into the administration of urban affairs and employment retraining programs. Though he started hearings on the National Cancer Program last year, the

(Continued on Page 5)

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1978

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Contributing Editor
Pamela Moore

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London)
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report*, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $75 (two years, $140); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

France: Candidates Court the Science Vote

Paris. At the national level, decision-making for research and development has been at a near-standstill in France for several months, pending the outcome of this month's crucial elections. Important vacancies have gone unfilled, including the directorship of the highest-ranking post in the government's R&D system, that of the Delegation General a la Recherche Scientifique et Technique (DGRST), which is roughly equivalent to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

But while research policy has been neglected, the nation's researchers are objects of great interest among the contending political parties. There are two reasons for this: First, their support is deemed to be of great value since they tend to be fairly vigorous propagators of political ideas and choices; and, second, each of the major parties, in its own fashion, hopes to mobilize the scientific community for the benefit of the economy in general and industry in particular.

There is some irony to this, since French scientists are generally disdainful of industrial connections and show little interest in economic affairs. Despite this, science is looked to as at least past of the remedy for France's ailing industrial base, and this is our first national election in which the major parties have been holding meetings and press conferences to discuss proposals for boosting R&D as a means of improving the economy.

With the Carter Administration also adopting a policy of research-to-the-rescue-of-industry (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 4), our American colleagues may find it interesting to look in on related events in France.

What are the party alignments and what are the proposals that each party is offering in regard to R&D?

On the right wing, we have the Democratic Union of France (UDF), the party of President Valery Giscard d'Estaing's supporters and the spokesman of the business-oriented upper-middle class. To its right is a hostile ally, the Rally for the Republic (RPR), which describes itself as the heir of Charles de Gaulle; its support is mainly in the conservative middle class. On the left are the Socialists, chaired by Francois Mitterand; its support is derived more from white-collar than from industrial workers. Then there are the Communists, who are ostensibly in alliance with the Socialists, but who have made it clear that they don't wish to share power with their supposed allies.

The RPR, which has been in power in coalition with the UDF since 1958, is in the odd position of denouncing what it describes as the decay of research in France, which it dates from 1969, which happens to be the year of the election of former President Pompidou, who appointed many of the officials who are at present responsible for R&D.

As a matter of fact, during de Gaulle's reign, government R&D expenditures increased 2.5 times in 10 years. Since then, the slope has been downward. Thus, RPR's

(Continued on Page 4)

SCANDALS

(Continued From Page 2)

next round, though long promised, is somewhere off in the unspecified future. Two staff members who are responsible for a lot of other things are working parttime on NIH management affairs; the latest word is that hearings will be held this summer, but no date has been set and there's a lot of vagueness surrounding the whole matter.

The National Cancer Act, object of an increasing amount of criticism, was up for another three-year extension last year, but Congress was so bogged down with unfinished business that the Act was extended one year, to this coming May. None of the committees concerned with NCI, however, has been doing the preparatory work that's required for serious hearings, and since there's a great deal of expiring health-related legislation to be handled on Capitol Hill this year, there's little likelihood that NCI will get the kind of airing that might illuminate the question of whether research has to any significant degree plunged off the ethical rails.

What makes all this quite disconcerting, in terms of the interests of the scientific community, is that the impression continues to mount that there's serious wrongdoing in the house of science. The leadership of the community has so far been silent, mainly, it can be assumed, because no one really knows how serious the problem may be. Even the rotten-apple theorists are reluctant to contend publicly that rectitude abounds, since tomorrow's news could well make them look foolish.

As a result, slow-moving, informal discussions, touching only partly on the problems of financial irregularities, are so far the main response from within the scientific community.

It is difficult to formulate a more decisive response to what is, after all, a vaguely defined, though potentially serious, problem. But before the problem, such as it may be, gets worse or is embraced by mischief makers, it would be prudent for the scientific establishment to address it directly, perhaps by setting up a special commission or at least a prestigious study group. As noted before, there may be public relations perils in even acknowledging the possibility of serious financial wrongdoing in science. But the perils of leaving the problem alone are probably greater. —DSG

. . . Big Promises, Even for Social Sciences

(Continued From Page 3)

criticism of the state of French research is indeed peculiar, for RPR has been in power during the period under criticism. Nevertheless, the Secretary of State for Research, Jacques Sourdille, who is a member of RPR, is apparently the author of the attack on what is, after all, his own performance.

The rhetoric is amusing. Using military terminology, RPR has declared: "Since 1974, we have been involved in an economic war. Our strategy must be based on a mobilization of the corps of researchers and of our research potential. This mobilization of brains is vital."

Carrying on with this theme, Sourdille urges an expansion of fundamental research, which "must become the main priority of French science policy. . ." — which is a strange statement from an official who has cut basic research budgets to provide additional funds for applied research.

But the most striking feature of the Gaullist turnaround is in its new embrace of the social sciences, for which they now deem desirable increased support and employment stability. What is to be noted in this regard is that after the 1968 uprisings, in which social scientists played a major precipitating role, it was the Gaullists who organized a witch-hunt against sociologists, economists, and town planners. Finally, the RPR wishes to establish an independent Ministry of Research.

Though the election-season timing of these affable policies toward research is a bit suspicious, it must at least be acknowledged that the RPR proposals are coherent. Though no specific financial committments are made, the RPR does call for supporting research at a rate of six to seven per cent above the growth rate of the gross national product.

The other component of the right wing, President Giscard d'Estaing's UDF, doesn't engage in any numerical promises, and, in fact, advances only modest promises, which is perhaps why it is more credible.

The UDF proposes, in a brief text, to seek to develop a system of technology assessment. It also calls for promoting closer collaboration between public and private research organizations, and to provide greater assistance for the development of new products. For scientists, the President's party is also pledging efforts to promote greater job mobility, always a problem in France, by providing for a sabbatical year in which, presumably, a scientist could try out for a different job without jeopardizing the one he has. The aim, of course, is to infuse additional scientific strength into industrial organizations, but since industry is not at all popular with French scientists, the wording tends to be discrete.

On the left side of science politics here, the Socialists and the Communists enjoy considerable popularity, and, therefore, do not feel obliged to out-promise the right. (A recent Gallup Poll concluded that 70 per cent of university people intended to vote for the Left). Therefore, the distinctions between Socialist and Communist positions tend to be focused on matters related to professional organizations and working conditions.

When the two parties signed their famous statement of cooperation in 1972, they agreed that the State should finance most research in the nation and that "the number of various specialists will be increased."

Though often referred to in discussions on the Left, it is only recently that the parties have felt compelled to flesh out these vague principles. Thus, the Communists now say that the role of science in the society of the future is to reduce inequalities, permit people to fulfill their potential, to improve working conditions, cleanse the environment, and so forth.

The Communist campaign statements call for increasing the nation's scientific work force at a rate of three per cent a year, and they also want to undertake a number of "great programs" in such fields as energy, microelectronics, data processing, avionics, space, and agriculture. For the Communists, it is also important to expand the use of French as a scholarly and scientific language!

R&D spending, under the Communist's promises, would rapidly increase, and there would be no closings of research facilities or reductions in research programs.

The Communists also call for guaranteeing "democracy and liberty in research." They propose that each research organization be directed "by a board which will freely elect its chairman. On this board, government

(Continued on Page 5)

German R&D Surges Ahead

West Germany is surging ahead of France in the proportion of gross national product devoted to research, according to a critical report recently issued by the French Consultative Committee for Scientific Research.

An advisory body appointed to provide the government with a professional overview of French research activities, the Committee reported that the French slice of GNP devoted to research dropped from 1.9 per cent in 1972 to 1.8 per cent in 1976; in that same period, West German spending rose from 1.9 per cent to 2.2 per cent.

Science Questions from Mr. Carter's Cabinet

Because we regularly prowl the corridors of government, mix with the elder statesmen of science, and occasionally receive illicit packets of official documents from unidentified sources, SGR is frequently credited with an understanding of what's going on in high places. Such credit is often justified, but then sometimes it is not.

As an example of the latter category, we direct our readers' attention to a 14-page document that we recently received, in an altogether above-board fashion, from the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP).

Addressed to *ALL SCIENCE WRITERS,* this communication commences with an explanation: It seems that OSTP Director Frank Press, in the course of an address last month to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, revealed that President Carter had asked members of the Cabinet to submit "research questions" to Dr. Press. Dr. Press recited several of those questions, but, apparently because time was limited, promised his audience that the complete list would later be made available by his office. So it has.

The list is indeed fascinating, for it suggests that, while our senior ministers are concerned with the simultaneous disappearances of coal, the dollar, and the inner cities, plus the mysterious goings-on in the Horn of Africa, not to mention Salt II, singles-bar etiquette, and Civil Service reform, they are also interested in other weighty, though less urgent matters. We quote from the Cabinet's list of "research questions," without comment, and certainly without understanding as to what this bizarre government exercise is all about:

- "What is the nature of the universe?"
- "Can the microbiology of the gastrointestinal tract of man and animals be controlled? Research on this important question is needed to understand the contribution of microbial activity to general health and its effect upon nutrient utilization."
- "What is the chemical basis of life? Where and how did it originate? Is a carbon-based chemistry a prerequisite for life? Does gravity play a significant role in the development and maintenance of life?"
- "Can simple chemical reactions be discovered that will generate visible radiation? The results of research on this question may lead to inexpensive lasers for communication and industrial uses."
- "Despite continued long-term real economic growth in the United States, why are many rural areas chronically depressed?"
- "Since the production time frame for timber is much longer than for most agricultural crops, the economic consequences from trade policies in timber products may not be fully apparent for decades. Better economic methodologies are needed for assessing the gross national product, social welfare, and capital formation in developing countries." [SGR assures its readers that this "research question" is quoted verbatim.]
- "How are the fundamental forces of nature related? Four types are currently known: nuclear (strong), electromagnetic, radioactive (weak), and gravitational. Only electromagnetism is well understood; the rest defy us to master them."
- "What is the nature of matter? Why is matter and charge quantized?"
- "How do we think?"

OSTP has not disclosed which cabinet officer asked which questions; nor has it indicated whether these inquiries are to be answered.

FRANCE

(Continued From Page 4)

representatives will not have the majority. All other members will be elected." Furthermore, at the national level, a top-ranking committee for research would replace the present ministry and the DGRST.

It should not be assumed that the Communist leaders prefer self-organization to a strong state power. Since, at best, the most they can hope for is that the elections will given them an opportunity to share power, their proposals are purely tactical. Their aim, it appears, is to establish science in a fashion that will remove it from direct government control by putting authority in the hands of the elected boards. Similarly, the Communists propose that industry be controlled by representatives of unions; needless to say, the party is strong in the unions.

The Socialist program represents less of a departure from present ways, which is not surprising, since it was prepared with the assistance of quite a few of the government bureaucrats who now manage the system.

It calls for greater planning in R&D and for promoting democracy in the laboratories through a complex system of committees in accordance with vague principles of "self-management."

Interestingly, the Socialists call for devoting more R&D to economic development, which is a somewhat new feature in a party whose scientist members generally shun economic interests.

However the elections turn out, our scientific community will have no grounds for feeling neglected — at least during the campaign for its votes. —FS

A List of Science Attaches in Washington

The previous issue of SGR contained a list of scientific and technical counselors and attaches stationed at US embassies, with the suggestion that they can be of assistance in obtaining information, publications, and so forth. The same is true of their counterparts that other nations assign to their embassies in Washington, though in many cases, science-related duties are handled here by general embassy personnel. Whatever the case, the foreign representatives in Washington can be reached by addressing them by name and title, Embassy of (whatever the country is), Washington, DC. Even in the present state of postal service, that's usually sufficient. Following is the latest roster, as furnished to SGR by the State Department:

AUSTRALIA:	Dr. Ron Knight, Counselor, Atomic Energy;
	Dr. James Harrington, Scientific Attache
AUSTRIA:	Mr. Gunter Birbaum, Counselor
BANGLADESH:	Mustafizur Rahman Siddiqi, Ambassador
BELGIUM:	Louis Goven, Scientific Counselor
BRAZIL:	Celso Diniz, Minister Counselor
CANADA:	Norman R. Chappell, Minister (Energy);
	George Rejohn, Counselor (Environment);
	Joseph MacDowell, Counselor (Scientific);
CHINA (TAIWAN):	Yu-Sung, Counselor, Science and Technology
CZECHOSLOVAKIA:	Josef Jarosek First Secretary (Head of Scientific Section)
EGYPT:	Ahmed Azzam, Counselor for Cultural Affairs
FINLAND:	Osmo Ville Kettunen, Scientific Attache;
	Mauri Hattunen, Scientific Attache;
FRANCE:	Jean Cantacuzene, Scientific Counselor;
	Pierre Zaleski, Nuclear Attache;
	Jean Jung, Scientific Attache (Computers Telecommunications);
	Eliane Morin, Scientific Attache, (Energy);
	Jean Mourlow, Scientific Attache (Oceans);
	Gerard Emploz, Scientific Attache (Environment);
	Austraire Straus, Scientific Attache (Biomedical, Agriculture);
	Michele Chevrel, Scientific Attache
GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC:	Dr. Helmut Lange, First Secretary (Scientific)
GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC:	Hans Bobrowski, First Secretary, Office of Science and Technology;
	Dr. Niels Hansen, Minister;
	Peter Witt, First Secretary (Energy and Economics)
GREAT BRITAIN:	Dr. John Gaunt, Attache (Atomic Energy);
	Dr. T.M. Moynehan, Attache (Technology)
	John McAuley, Attache (Technology)
HUNGARY:	Ferenc Jarmer, First Secretary (Scientific)
INDIA:	Dr. M. Anandakrishnan, Counselor (Scientific)
IRAN:	Dr. Abbas Ordoobadi, Counselor (Agricultural and Rural Affairs)
ISRAEL:	Eliezar Efrati, Scientific Counselor
ITALY:	Dr. Umberto Ratti, Counselor
JAPAN:	Kiichiro Nagara, Scientific Counselor
	Kazuo Suzuki, First Secretary (scientific)
MEXICO:	Dr. Enrique-Martin del Campo, Scientific Counselor
NETHERLANDS:	C. Herman van Vierssen, First Secretary (Scientific)
PERU:	Humberto Urteaga, Counselor
POLAND:	Dr. Wladyslaw Czulno, Scientific and Technological Counselor;
	Wojciech Bogusz, Scientific and Technological Attache
ROMANIA:	Adrian Petrescu, Second Secretary
SOUTH AFRICA:	Dr. Ronald Gordon Shuttleworth, Scientific Counselor
SPAIN:	Martin Gallego, Industrial Counselor
SWEDEN:	Lars Ortegren, Scientific Counselor;
	Lars-Inge A. Helander, Assistant Science attache
SWITZERLAND:	Dr. Christian Favre, Scientific Counselor
USSS:	Vladislav K. Dobrosel'skiy, Counselor (Science and Technology)
YUGOSLAVIA:	Milos Rajacic, Counselor (Scientific)

New CIA Charge in Soviet Scientist Case

The celebrated case of "refusenik" Anatoly Scharansky — to whom the US National Academy of Sciences has pledged assistance (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 1) — has taken a confusing turn with the revelation that a former roommate of the imprisoned Soviet computer specialist once served as an informant for the CIA.

The Scharansky case has drawn an unusual amount of international attention because of the rough handling he's received from Soviet authorities — nearly a year of incommunicado imprisonment; the threat of a treason charge against him; President Carter's flat assertion last June that the CIA had no connection with Scharansky, and a subsequent letter from NAS President Philip Handler, warning President Brezhnev that if the NAS is not permitted to send a legal observer to his trial, US-USSR scientific relations may suffer.

Now, to the embarrassment of all parties, US intelligence sources have confirmed a *Time* magazine report last week that Scharansky's former roommate, identified as a Dr. Sanya L. Lipavsky, had voluntarily offered his own services to the CIA for less than a year in 1975-76. Lipavsky said that Scharansky was also involved, though there's no confirmation of that charge.

In any case, the situation leaves the President in an exposed position, and raises the question of whether the NAS is on firm ground in taking up the cause of this particular Soviet dissident.

The Academy has received no direct response to its request and, meanwhile, the Soviets appear determined to go ahead with a trial, though they haven't been specific about a date or charge. The Soviets have, however, appointed an attorney to represent him, and reports are that the trial will take place soon.

All of which is quite disconcerting to various organizations interested in human rights and the problems of Soviet dissidents. The alleged CIA link may be tenuous or even non-existent, but before so many people went to bat for the unfortunate Scharansky, it would have been prudent for the CIA to be candid about the situation.

In Quotes: NAS Head Says Everything Okay

The following excerpts are from an address, "Pangs of Science," by Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, February 14, in Washington:

. . . .For most environmental pollutants that have been called to attention, we are concerned with potential but as yet undemonstrated hazard. Statistically speaking, relatively few persons have been known actually to have been seriously damaged by manmade chemicals. . . .

We have become highly conscious of such [environmental] problems; EPA, NCI, OSHA and a host of other institutions, public and private, are alert and vigilant. The result has been a stream of regulations, each well intentioned, each, indeed commendable. But in the absence of persuasive data concerning the magnitude of risk, if any, to humans, the sum of such regulation can engender public cynicism, ensnarl life in the workplace and slowly paralyze the economic life of the nation. . . . A decade ago, it was necessary, even desirable, to flag public attention to potential hazard and proceed as if the hazard were a clear and present danger. It is time to return to the ethics and norms of science so that the political process may then proceed with some confidence. . . .

Scientists best serve public policy by living within the ethics of science, not those of politics.

(Handler's address was a lengthy one, and these excerpts, though revealing, reflect only part of its contents. A complete text may be obtained by requesting "Pangs of Science" from the Office of the President, National Academy of Science, 2101 Constitution Ave. N.W., kWashington, DC 20418).

US-Bulgarian Science Pact

The US and the People's Republic of Bulgaria have entered into a five-year agreement on scientific and technological cooperation, the first of its kind between the two countries. Signed February 9 in Washington, the agreement comes under a general exchange agreement signed last June, and is described as covering "all branches of science and technology" outside of clinical medicine, business administration and education.

The National Science Foundation administers the US end of the agreement. For additional information: Charles Zalar, International Division, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550. Tel. (202) 632-5756.

OTA Head Voted Greater Staff Authority

Russell Peterson's authority as director of the Office of Technology Assessment received a strong boost March 1 when OTA's board of Congressional overseers agreed to give him full hiring and firing power over all OTA employees.

The shift in authority, for which the recently appointed Peterson indicated he was willing to go to the brink, is considered a vital matter in the governence of the long-troubled agency. Under the previous arrangement, each of the 12-member Congressional Board had authority to appoint a staffer to look after his or her dealings with OTA. The result was considerable uncertainty as to whom the staffer was working for, OTA or the individual member.

In announcing the Board's decision, Peterson clearly indicated that the new arrangement does away with a source of difficulty:

"This is an important milestone," he said. "The Board has faced up to a serious problem that was interfering with OTA effectiveness. Now we can concentrate on making OTA an even better institution for advising Congress in a non-biased, even-handed and authoritative way."

Senator Edward Kennedy, chairman of the Board, said the decision will enable the Board to "return to the role mandated by our enabling Act of formulating policy and shaping the direction of OTA."

Women-in-Science Bill

Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) has introduced a bill that's intended to encourage more women to seek careers in science and technology and also to prod federal agencies, particularly the National Science Foundation, into providing more research opportunities for women.

Titled the Women in Science and Technology Equal Opportunity Act, the bill has little chance of passage at this busy stage of the Congressional session, but Kennedy hopes to stir up and illuminate the issue for a serious try next year.

Copies of the bill are available from the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, US Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Telephone: (202) 224-7675.

State Dept. Education Post Filled

Alice S. Ilchman, dean of Wellesley College, has been nominated by President Carter to be Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, succeeding Joseph D. Duffey, who was appointed last summer to head the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106